

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
**PCT200412113**

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

**PCT/JP2004/013659**

International filing date (day/month/year)

**17.09.2004**

Priority date (day/month/year)

**21.10.2003**

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

**NIPPON SEIKI CO., LTD.**

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- |                                     |              |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I    | Basis of the opinion   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. II   | Priority   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. III  | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. IV   | Lack of unity of invention   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V    | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VI   | Certain documents cited  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VII  | Certain defects in the international application   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application  |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/013659

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language  
\_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/013659

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
<b>1. Statement</b>			
Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>3-8, 12, 14</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 2, 9-11, 13, 15-19</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>4</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-3, 5-19</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-19</u>	YES
	Claims	<u></u>	NO
<b>2. Citations and explanations:</b>			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2003-291688, A (DENSO CORPORATION), 15 October, 2003 (15.10.03), full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 10-111137, A (Hitachi, Ltd.), 28 April, 1998, full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 09-287960, A (XANAVI INFORMATICS CORPORATION), 4 November, 1997 (04.11.97), full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 10-269495, A (Mitsubishi Motors Corporation), 9 October, 1998 (09.10.98), full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13 and 15-19</p> <p>Inventions related to claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13 and 15-19 do not appear to be novel on account of the document 1 cited in the ISR. The composition to display a road shape mage and three-dimensional information on the road described in claims 1 and 2 are disclosed in [0028]-[0060] of the document 1.</p> <p>Claim 3</p> <p>The invention related to claim 3 does not appear to be inventive on account of the documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. The invention described in the document 1 and that described in the document 2 belong to mutually closely related technical fields. So, as the three-dimensional information described in the document 1, adopting the height difference of a road described in the document 2 could have easily been conceived by a person skilled in the art.</p> <p>Claim 4</p> <p>The invention described in claim 4 is inventive on account of the documents cited in the ISR. Document 1 does not describe a composition for displaying on a display means an inclination index showing a right-left inclination of a road as three-dimensional information, and on account of the documents cited in the ISR, the point would not easily be conceived even by a person skilled in the art.</p> <p>Claims 5 and 6</p> <p>Inventions described in claims 5 and 6 do not appear to be inventive on account of the documents 1 and 3 cited in the ISR. The invention described in the document 1 and that described in the document 3 belong to mutually closely related technical fields. So, as the three-dimensional information described in the document 1, adopting the distance index described in the document 3 showing equal distance intervals of a road with a plurality of lines could have easily been conceived by a person skilled in the art.</p> <p>Claims 7 and 8</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/013659

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement

Inventions described in claims 7 and 8 do not appear to be inventive on account of the documents 1 and 4 cited in the ISR. The invention described in the document 1 and that described in the document 4 belong to mutually closely related technical fields. So, as the three-dimensional information described in the document 1, adopting the curvature index or the display showing a sharp curve described in the document 4 could have easily been conceived by a person skilled in the art.

Claim 12

The invention described in claim 12 does not appear to be inventive on account of the documents 1 and 3 cited in the ISR. The invention described in the document 1 and that described in the document 3 belong to mutually closely related technical fields. So, as the road shape images described in the document 1, adopting the images near and forward of a vehicle described in the document 3 could have easily been conceived by a person skilled in the art.

Claim 14

The invention described in claim 14 does not appear to be inventive on account of the documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. The invention described in the document 1 and that described in the document 2 belong to mutually closely related technical fields. So, applying the point of displaying the vehicle index described in the document 2 to the road shape image described in the document 1 could have easily been conceived by a person skilled in the art.